



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,857	03/19/2004	Jamshid Parivash	88094.2	7430
44955 7590 11/29/2007 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 1 MARITIME PLAZA, SUITE 300 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			EXAMINER RAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/804,857

Applicant(s)

PARIVASH, JAMSHID

Examiner

Sharad Rampuria

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-15 and 20-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-15 and 20-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 September 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

I. The Art Unit location of this application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 2617.

#### ***Disposition of the claims***

II. The current office-action is in response to the Amendment - After Non-Final Rejection filed on 09/10/2007.

Accordingly, Claims 8, 16-19 are cancelled and Claims 20-25 is newly appended claims, thus, Claims 1-7, 9-15, 20-25 are imminent for further assessment as follows:

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

III. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the

time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-7, 9-15, 20, 22, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Warren** [US 20030153355] in view of **North** [US 20030092468].

As per claim 1, **Warren** teaches:

A system (Abstract) comprising:

A personal digital assistant (PDA; 10; Fig.1, ¶ 0032, further in ¶ 0053) comprising a rechargeable battery; (40; Fig.2, ¶ 0041) and

A cellular phone (12; Fig.1, ¶ 0032, 0038) comprising a rechargeable battery (e.g. cell phone includes a battery; 12; Fig.3, ¶ 0042) adapted to be coupled to the PDA so that upon coupling the cellular phone to the PDA the combined cellular phone and PDA forms a single body. (e.g.; the device 10; of Fig.1, looks like a single body when the portable phone insert into the slot of the device; 10, ¶ 0032, 0009 further more in Figs.10-11, ¶ 0052).

**Warren** doesn't teach specifically, when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled, either the cell phone rechargeable battery or the PDA rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and PDA. However, **North** teaches in an analogous art, that wherein when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled, either the cell phone rechargeable battery or the PDA rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and PDA. (e.g. Cell phone and PDA technologies have also been merged into a single device in the form of smartphones that share common circuitry, display and power sources to supply the respective telephone and data

processing functions. For example; The battery pack not only powers the systems of the primary housing, but also supplies energy for charging the batteries 52 of the console unit 14; 94; Fig.1, ¶ 0022) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify **Warren** including when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled, either the cell phone rechargeable battery or the PDA rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and PDA in order to provide a representation by a combination of cell phone and PDA device, into a primary housing for containment of a power source and primary control circuitry.

As per claim 2, **Warren** teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the size of the single body is substantially the same as the size of the PDA. (The device 10; of Fig.1, looks like a single body when the portable phone insert into the slot of the device; 10, ¶ 0032)

As per claim 3, **Warren** teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the PDA and the cellular phone each has a latching mechanism for latching the cellular phone to the PDA when the cellular phone is coupled to the PDA. (56; Fig.4, ¶ 0045 further more in Figs.10-11, ¶ 0052)

As per claim 4, **Warren** teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the PDA has a cavity configured such that the cellular phone can be inserted therein. (28; Fig.4, ¶ 0046)

As per claim 5, **Warren** teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the PDA has a cut-out portion configured so that when the cellular phone is coupled to the PDA, the cellular phone substantially fills the cut-out portion of the PDA. (26c; Fig.6, ¶ 0049)

As per claim 6, **Warren** teaches:

The system of claim 1 wherein the PDA has a keyboard (16; Fig.1, ¶ 0033) and a display (20; Fig.1, ¶ 0033), the cellular phone and the PDA being adapted so that when the cellular phone is coupled to the PDA, the PDA keyboard and display are used in placing or receiving telephone calls. (e.g. the communication with other computer, or remotely access the information such as internet, ¶ 0034)

As per claim 7, **Warren** teaches:

The system of claim 6 wherein the cellular phone and the PDA are adapted so that when the cellular phone is coupled to the PDA, the keyboard and the display of the PDA is used along with the wireless communication resources of the cellular phone to connect to and communicate with the internet. (e.g. the communication with other computer, or remotely access the information such as internet, ¶ 0034-0035)

As per claim 9, **Warren** teaches:

A system (Abstract) comprising:

A processing device (PDA; 10; Fig.1, ¶ 0032, further in ¶ 0053) comprising a rechargeable battery; (40; Fig.2, ¶ 0041) and

A cellular phone (12; Fig.1, ¶ 0032, 0038) comprising a rechargeable battery (e.g. cell phone includes a battery; 12; Fig.3, ¶ 0042) adapted to be coupled to the PDA so that upon coupling the cellular phone to the PDA the combined cellular phone and PDA forms a single body. (e.g.; the device 10; of Fig.1, looks like a single body when the portable phone insert into the slot of the device; 10, ¶ 0032, 0009 further more in Figs.10-11, ¶ 0052).

**Warren** doesn't teach specifically, when the processing device and the cell phone are coupled the processing device rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and processing device. However, **North** teaches in an analogous art, that wherein when the processing device and the cell phone are coupled the processing device rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and processing device. (e.g. Cell phone and PDA technologies have also been merged into a single device in the form of smartphones that share common circuitry, display and power sources to supply the respective telephone and data processing functions. For example; The battery pack not only powers the systems of the primary housing, but also supplies energy for charging the batteries 52 of the console unit 14; 94; Fig.1, ¶ 0022).

As per claim 10, **Warren** teaches:

The system of claim 9, wherein the processing device is one of a PDA, a laptop computer, a desktop PC, and an automobile. (PDA; 10; Fig.1, ¶ 0032, further in ¶ 0053)

As per claim 11, **Warren** teaches:

A system (Abstract) comprising:

A laptop computer (PDA; 10; Fig.1, ¶ 0032, further in ¶ 0053) comprising a rechargeable battery; (40; Fig.2, ¶ 0041) and

A cellular phone (12; Fig.1, ¶ 0032, 0038) comprising a rechargeable battery (e.g. cell phone includes a battery; 12; Fig.3, ¶ 0042) adapted to be coupled to the PDA so that upon coupling the cellular phone to the PDA the combined cellular phone and PDA forms a single body. (e.g.; the device 10; of Fig.1, looks like a single body when the portable phone insert into the slot of the device; 10, ¶ 0032, 0009 further more in Figs.10-11, ¶ 0052).

**Warren** doesn't teach specifically, when the laptop and the cell phone are coupled the laptop rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and laptop. However, **North** teaches in an analogous art, that wherein when the laptop and the cell phone are coupled the laptop rechargeable battery can power the combined cellular phone and laptop. (e.g. Cell phone and PDA technologies have also been merged into a single device in the form of smartphones that share common circuitry, display and power sources to supply the respective telephone and data processing functions. For example; The battery pack not only powers the systems of the primary housing, but also supplies energy for charging the batteries 52 of the console unit 14; 94; Fig.1, ¶ 0022).

**Claims 12-15** are the **system**, claims, corresponding to **system** claims 2-5 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-5 respectively, above.



As per claim 20, **Warren** teaches all the particulars of the claim except the PDA battery is the default power source for the combined cellular phone and PDA. However, **North** teaches in an analogous art, that the system of claim 1, wherein the PDA battery is the default power source for the combined cellular phone and PDA. (e.g. The battery pack of the primary housing; 94; Fig.1, ¶ 0022).

As per claim 22, **Warren** teaches all the particulars of the claim except when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled, the cell phone battery can be recharged by the PDA battery. However, **North** teaches in an analogous art, that the system of claim 1, wherein when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled, the cell phone battery can be recharged by the PDA battery. (e.g. The battery pack not only powers the systems of the primary housing, but also supplies energy for charging the batteries 52 of the console unit 14; 94; Fig.1, ¶ 0022).

As per claim 24, **Warren** teaches all the particulars of the claim except when the laptop and the cell phone are coupled, the cell phone battery can be recharged by the laptop battery. However, **North** teaches in an analogous art, that the system of claim 11, wherein when the laptop and the cell phone are coupled, the cell phone battery can be recharged by the laptop battery. (e.g. The battery pack not only powers the systems of the primary housing, but also supplies energy for charging the batteries 52 of the console unit 14; 94; Fig.1, ¶ 0022).

As per claim 25, **Warren** teaches:

A system (Abstract) comprising:

A personal digital assistant (PDA; 10; Fig.1, ¶ 0032, further in ¶ 0053) comprising a rechargeable battery; (40; Fig.2, ¶ 0041) and

A cellular phone (12; Fig.1, ¶ 0032, 0038) comprising a rechargeable battery (e.g. cell phone includes a battery; 12; Fig.3, ¶ 0042) adapted to be coupled to the PDA so that upon coupling the cellular phone to the PDA the combined cellular phone and PDA forms a single body. (e.g.; the device 10; of Fig.1, looks like a single body when the portable phone insert into the slot of the device; 10, ¶ 0032, 0009 further more in Figs.10-11, ¶ 0052).

**Warren** doesn't teach specifically, when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled the cell phone battery can be recharged by the PDA battery. However, **North** teaches in an analogous art, that wherein when the PDA and the cell phone are coupled the cell phone battery can be recharged by the PDA battery. (e.g. Cell phone and PDA technologies have also been merged into a single device in the form of smartphones that share common circuitry, display and power sources to supply the respective telephone and data processing functions. For example; The battery pack not only powers the systems of the primary housing, but also supplies energy for charging the batteries 52 of the console unit 14; 94; Fig.1, ¶ 0022).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Warren & North** further in view of **Chmaytelli** [US 6233464].

As per claim 21, the above combination teaches all the particulars of the claim except a switch that allows for the user to switch the default power source to the cell phone battery.

However, **Chmaytelli** teaches in an analogous art, that the system of claim 20, wherein the PDA further comprises a switch that allows for the user to switch the default power source to the cell phone battery. (e.g. a switch which, if selected by the user, will power-on the Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) in response to the stylus being removed from the PDA. The switch, also selectably, will power-off PDA in response to the stylus being replaced into the PDA. The switch further allows selection as to whether either or both of these actions will also turn the telephone on or off; abstract, Col.1; 39-46, Col.2; 6-23) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the above combination including a switch that allows for the user to switch the default power source to the cell phone battery in order to provide an invention relates to powering on and off a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA), such as a Palm Pilot, and in co-ordination with a combined wireless telephone.

Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Warren & North** further in view of **Dowling et al.** [US 20030050019].

As per claim 23, the above combination teaches all the particulars of the claim except a sliding door that can conceal the cell phone, and that can also slide open to allow the access to the cell phone when it is coupled to the PDA. However, **Dowling** teaches in an analogous art, that the system of claim 5, wherein the PDA further comprises a sliding door that can conceal the cell phone, and that can also slide open to allow the access to the cell phone when it is coupled to the PDA. (337; Fig.4B, ¶ 0046). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the above combination including a

sliding door that can conceal the cell phone, and that can also slide open to allow the access to the cell phone when it is coupled to the PDA in order to provide systems and methods to enable a mobile unit to access an expanded set of peripherals.

***Response to Amendments & Remarks***

IV. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-15, 20-25 has been fully considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

V. Applicant's amendment (For illustration; since newly amended claims, modified the above-disclosed rejection) necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number:  
10/804,857  
Art Unit: 2617

Page 12

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is (571) 272-7870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. (8:30-5 EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000 or

[EBC@uspto.gov](mailto:EBC@uspto.gov).

/Sharad Rampuria/  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2617